1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Bingham McCutchen LLP GREGORY LIPPETZ (SBN 154228) Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 Telephone: (415) 393-2000 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286 gregory.lippetz@bingham.com  Bingham McCutchen LLP RICHARD S. TAFFET Pro Hac Vice (NY SBN 1721182) 399 Park Avenue New York, NY 10022-4689 Telephone: (212) 705-7000 Facsimile: (212) 752-5378 richard.taffet@bingham.com  Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant SANDISK CORPORATION	S DISTRICT COURT			
12					
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
14	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
15 16 17	SANDISK CORPORATION, Plaintiff, vs.	No. C 07-03618 JF  SANDISK'S SUPPLEMENTAL CASE  MANAGEMENT REPORT RE: STAY  OF ACTION			
18 19	LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC. and ALCATEL-LUCENT, S.A.,				
20	Defendants.				
21					
22	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM				
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
		C 07-03618 JF			

1	Plaintiff SanDisk Corporation ("SanDisk") submits this Supplemental Case			
2	Management Statement to report on the parties' negotiations relating to Lucent's Motion to			
3	Dismiss Without Prejudice or Stay Pending Resolution of Appeal in Related Case.			
4	On October 12, 2007, defendants Lucent Technologies Inc. and Alcatel-Lucent			
5	S.A. (collectively "Lucent") filed a Motion to Dismiss Without Prejudice or Stay Pending			
6	Resolution of Appeal in Related Case (the "Motion"). On November 30, 2007, and on			
7	February 15, 2008, the Court heard argument from the parties related to Lucent's Motion, and			
8	requested that the parties meet and confer to discuss whether they could reach an agreement			
9	under which this action could be stayed. Pursuant to the Court's request, the parties have been			
10	negotiating the terms under which SanDisk would consent to a stay of this action. Attached as			
11	<b>Exhibit A</b> is a draft stipulation that the parties have agreed to, except for one issue, as to which			
12	they seek the Court's guidance.			
13	The attached stipulation provides the minimum protection needed for SanDisk to			
14	consent to a stay of this action. As discussed in SanDisk's Opposition to the Motion, SanDisk			
15	must obtain relief from the uncertainties created by Lucent's assertion of the patents. SanDisk			
16	Opposition to Motion at pp.6-7; Electronics For Imaging, Inc. v. Coyle, 394 F.3d 1341, 1346-			
17	47 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Only a judgment in SanDisk's favor would remove all of the uncertainty			
18	created by Lucent's assertions. However, the Stipulation alleviates enough of this uncertainty			
19	to allow SanDisk to consent to delay a determination of its rights and consent to a stay.			
20	The parties disagree over one issue in the attached Stipulation: the length of the			
21	stay period. The Stipulation defines the end of the stay period as the Termination Date, plus			
22	some number of months. The parties disagree over the definition of Termination Date, and over			
23	the number of months that the stay will remain in place after the Termination Date.			
24	SanDisk proposes that the stay remain in effect until all of the issues in the			
25	Microsoft case that could effect this case are fully and finally resolved. Lucent's position has			
26	always been that this action should be stayed until the "resolution" of the issues in the Microsof			
27	case that could effect this case. See Lucent's Motion at 6:7, 7:7 and 7:11. This position is			
28	consistent with the discussion that the parties had with the Court on February 15, in discussing			

1	the need for finality of the <i>Microsoft</i> appeal before the stay would dissolve. To achieve this				
2	goal, SanDisk proposes the following definition of Termination Date, which appears in the				
3	attached draft:				
4	"Termination Date" shall mean the date on which all of the issues currently on appeal, except those specifically related to damages, in the "Group 2: Audio				
5	Patents" portion of the case captioned Lucent Technologies, Inc., et al v. Gateway,				
6	et. al., Appeal Nos. 2007-1546, -1580 are fully and finally resolved, including exhaustion of all appeals, re-trials, or other proceedings of any kind.				
7					
8	SanDisk's definition allows the stay to remain in place so long as the issues from				
9	the Microsoft case that could effect this action remain unresolved. SanDisk also proposes that				
10	the stay remain in place for nine months after the Termination Date to give SanDisk sufficient				
11	time to consider and implement a possible design-around Lucent's patents.				
12	In contrast, Lucent proposes that the stay be dissolved six months after the				
13	Federal Circuit issues its ruling, regardless of whether or not that ruling resolves any or all of				
14	the issues that could effect this case. As the Court is aware, the Federal Circuit has, historically				
15	issued a variety of rulings under these circumstances, including partial affirmances, remands for				
16	further proceedings, etc. Furthermore, given the billions of dollars at stake in the Microsoft				
17	case, it is likely that one or both of the parties will seek review of the Federal Circuit's ruling by				
18	the Supreme Court. Under Lucent's definition, if the Federal Circuit leaves unresolved issues				
19	that could effect this action, the stay will dissolve, and the parties will be in the same position as				
20	they were when Lucent filed its Motion. The parties will then be back in front of this Court				
21	arguing the same issues that they are trying to resolve now. Furthermore, Lucent proposes that				
22	the stay remain in place for only six months after the Termination Date. However, if the				
23	Federal Circuit were to remand the case, or if the Supreme Court were to review the Federal				
24	Circuit's ruling, six months would be insufficient time to allow for the final resolution of issues				
25	that could effect this action.				
26	///				
27	///				
28	///				
	3 C 07-03618 IF				

1	Therefore, SanDisk respectfully requests that the Court adopt the attached Stipulation as its					
2	Order on Lucent's Motion.					
3	DATED: March 7, 2008					
5		Bingham McCutchen LLP				
6		-				
7						
8		By:	/s/ Gregory L. Lippetz Gregory L. Lippetz	<u> </u>		
9		Atte	Gregory L. Lippetz orneys for Plaintiff/Counter-D SanDisk Corporation	Defendant		
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
		4		C 07-03618 JF		